SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: You direct the Government to explain...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta, if you go on talking along with me, I do not have that big voice which can match your voice. Therefore, please allow me to say whatever I want to.

When the thing comes up before you, these are legitimate questions which you can ask the Government. Now, Mr. Advani.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Had I even the slightest doubt that the Government had released it, I would have raised it as a matter of privilege. I did not do it because I am aware that the press comes to know of very many things. In this case I am sure that a decision of this kind must have been taken last night at the Cabinet meeting and having taken it, it is the duty of the Government to inform you that we proposed to make a statement about this matter at such and such time. Even at this point of time the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs tells you (*Interruptions*). Earlier you had conveyed to me, you had said, that it was going to be made at 5 O'clock and you can ask clarifications at that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I did not say 5; I said around 5.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: There is a difference between what was conveyed by you earlier and what the Minister now says. What I am saying is that in all these matters the Government must regard it as its duty to take the earliest opportunity to come to the House or at least inform you of what they propose to do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Advani, I give you the first liberty to raise this question when the Minister makes a statemen.

Now let us proceed to the Calling-Attention. Mr. Suresh Kalmadi.

CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Delay in the completion of the Hazira-Bijaipur-Jagdishpur Gas pipeline project

SHRI SURESH KALMADI (Maharashtra): Sir I beg to call the attention of the Minister of Petroleum and Natural Gas to the reported delay in the completion of the Hazira-Bijaipur-Jagdishpur Gas Pipeline Project and the steps taken by Government in this regard.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS (SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR SINGH): Sir, The HBJ Gas Pipeline Project was approved by Government of India in April 1984 at an estimated cost of Rs. 1700.17 crores. This project contemplates laying of a 1730 km. long pipeline with necessary facilities from Hazira in Gujarat to Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh to meet the feedstock requirements of six fertilizer plants, and fuel requirements of two of the three power plants being set up along the pipeline. The construction schedules of the various sections of the pipeline have been determined to be in harmony with the schedule of commissioning of the fertilizer plants as determined by the Department of Fertilizers. The project is scheduled to be completed in all aspects by July 1989.

2. Global bids were called for by GAIL in June/July 1985 on the composite tender basis for the award of contract for the construction of pipeline. Four bids in complete shape were received by 27-8-1985, the last date for receipt of bids. The unpriced bids were opened on 28-8-1985 and evaluated for technical and Commercial aspects by GAIL and EIL. The price bids were opened on 1-11-1985. GAIL's recommendations on the award of contract were received by this Ministry on 14-11-1985, these are now under Government's consideration,

taking also into account the financing proposals received from the various bidders. Decision on the award of contract is expected to be taken shortly.

SHRI SURESH KALMADI: Sir, this is yet another case where Parliament is not being given the news at all. If you want to know what the progress is of the HBJ pipeline project, you have got to read the newspapers.

Sir, the story of the HBJ gas pipeline is a story of cloak-and-dagger methods, a story of indecision, a story of corruption, a story of international lobbying and, indeed, is a story of a lot of delays. For a Government which is supposed to be working faster, one would indeed be surprised at the delay and the huge cost to the national exchequer.

Sir, the Government, during the last one year, has totally lost its name in the international market because of the tendering practices it follows, be it the HBJ pipeline project or the Airbus contract. In the latter case, Boeings were awarded the entire contract after 1½ years of a Committee having gone into it. Suddenly, one day, one found, without any committee having gone into it, the contract was awarded to somebody worth about two thousand to three thousand crores. Similar is the case with the HBJ pipeline. The foreign countries are no longer interested in coming to India.

Sir, the HBJ pipeline project had been setin motion in March, 1984 and the project was to have been completed in 36 months, that is, by March, 1987 and today, the Minister says that the project will be ready by July, 1989! There is two years' delay, as per the admission of the Government itself. You are aware, Sir, that so many fertilizer plants are coming up in various parts of the country. The work which was supposed to have been completed in 1984-85 is going to be completed in Guna in June, 1986, that is, June of this year, and our pipeline is going to be completed in 1989! Then, Part II of the project is going to be completed by June, 1986 and the Part III is supposed to be completed by June, 1987. Now, with regard to the tender for the pipeline project also, about the first tender you are hiding and you are talking about the second tender only. When was the first tender called? When was it called? It was called in 1984 and so, two years have elapsed and we are again back to square one with no decision having been taken on the pipeline project. Two years' delay at 80 per cent of the plant utilisation means a total loss of 9.6 million tonnes of urea valued at 200 dollars per tonne. This comes to a total of Rs. 2500 crores equipment which has already arrived in the country. The interest works out to Rs. 100 crores. It is just lying idle because of the indecision of the Govenment which is supposed to have been working faster. Also take into account the flaring of the gas which is going on in Bombay High. Take into account the cost of the national loss of two LPG plants which were supposed to have come in time, which are not coming up. Take into account three gas-based power plants which are supposed to have come up. And time was the essence of the project. We have lost to the tune of nearly Rs. 3000 crores of taxpayers' money because of the lethargic attitude, because of the intrigues that have been going in this present Government, which led to the resignation of the Petroleum Minister just a few days back.

Sir, the HBJ story started in April, 1984 when global tender was invited. The responsibility was given to the EIL as the prime contractor and they decided to go in for piecemeal, the whole contract to be divided into four-five parts. In July, 1984 various countries bid for the tender. They came and sat down in the ONGC office in Delhi. As the tender was being opened—this was way back in July

[Shri Suresh Kalmadi]

1984—there was a phone call from somewhere and then the tender opening was stopped and they said: we will get back to you. Then, in September, 1984, entered Snamprogetti, till then they were nowhere, they did not bid. But once the tenders were opened, people knew what the bids were. This is a unique case in international tendering procedures. In June the Government decided on turnkey project instead of giving it to various 4-5 sections. And what of course followed we will come to later.

Earlier, the turnkey project was rejected by the Government of India, by Mrs. Indira Gandhi, because indigenous participation was to be tested by the foreign contracts. It would dilute the indigenous content of the project and undermine the proven domestic capability in the field. That is why they did not go in for turnkey project. Initially the contract was handed over to Engineers (India) Ltd., and they were given the maximum facilities to indigenise, a lot of Indian companies taking part in the project. Unfortunately, it was taken off then, and another global tender for having it on turnkey basis was floated, thus strangulating the Indian engineering industry.

Sir, there are many cases where India has done pipelines. Way back in 1960 we have done a 1200 km. pipeline, done by Oil India Also a 1200 km. pipeline to transport crude from Kovali and Mathura refinery. Also, a 525 km. pipeline was made from Mathura refinery to North-west India. All done indigenously. We did import equipment. Why could we have not done this pipeline? And the pipeline could be started two years back if the original tenders had been honoured and by now the pipeline project would have been halfway through.

Anyway, we come to the story of the latest turnkey bid The tenders were finally opened a few months back, six months back. What was it all about? Though the Minister is not prepared to part with what were the quotations of various parties, I am sure it is open knowledge. And what figures I state you will have to accept, though you are keeping it away from us.

The French-Japanese consortium quoted Rs. 739 crores. The Maxican company quoted Rs. 751 crores. Snamprogetti, the Italian company, quoted Rs. 859 crores, and the Canadian company, Nova Corp. quoted Rs. 1260 crores. All these four companies were short-listed after the technical committee said that these four companies are okay and they could do it. On the basis of that, the Gas Authority of India and the Engineers India Limited decided to give it to the French Copag's Spie Consortium because it was the lowest tender, by far the lowest from others. The Petroleum Ministry agreed with the recommendation of the Gas Authority of India and Engineers India, the Finance Ministry also agreed with it. The only dissenting note was that of the Industry Ministry who wanted it to be given to somebody else. Snamprogetti which moved in at the last minute, raised hell about it. They said they had objections on technical merits of the tender of the French consortium and they said that the Japanese consortium also did not meet with the requisite expertise. I do not know why this company did not tell the Government or did not tell the tendering authorities about this complaint, why they did not put it across to the technical authorities before the tender was opened. Why are they saying all this after the tender is opened?—I do not know. You are aware of the press conferences or the press releases which a taking place between all these companies. Rimeri Caboli of Italy started the first salvo by taking it up at a press conference. This was followed by the French Copag group. They also raised objections at a press conference. They are also lobbying and finally when the Prime Minister was asked whether he received complaints about this

tender, he replied that he had received complaints from the Canadian Government and the Italian Government about the tendering procedure in this country. I am very surprised that we ourselves have to be dictated to by other countries about the tendering process in this country. Don't we know what is good for our country? Do we have to be dictated to by different Governments? Are we admitting that what we did in the first place over the past two years is all wrong? So, after all this is over and when in Parliament the Petroleum Minister said that a decision will be taken by 31st December, 1985, just two days after that the Government referred the entire matter to another committee and we were back to square one, handing over the entire reins to Shri P. K. Kaul committee and now the P. K. Kaul committee is sitting over the matter and the ball game is again wide open and the lobbying is in full swing again. I believe just two days back another committee has been appointed to evaluate which turbine we should go in for. The Government could not decide so long on the controversy of aeroderivative type or industrial type gas turbines for the HBJ project which has literally bogged the project. For two years you could not decide the question and you appointed another committee. What is happening in this country? Why the GAIL tender had specifically mentioned preference for aeoderivative type engines while all over the world most gas pipelines use industrial type turbines because of low maintenance and larger time between overhauls? When industrial turbines with aeroderivative features like better efficiency and light weight are available, why only aeroderivative was preferred?—We do not know.

I would also like to take the opportunity to bring out the injustice being done to my home-State, Maharashtra. when just outside Maharashtra is the Bombay High Gas and when the pipeline was going to seven fertilizer plants in the north. When seven fertilizerplants were given to the north. we asked for one fertilizer plant near Malkapur where a report has been done by the National Fertilizer Corporation. We said the pipeline has to go across Maharashtra, so give one fertilizer plant for Vidarbha in Malkapur. Unfortunately, the Government spent much more money, Rs. 50 crores extra to purposely deny once for all the Bombay High gas which is very near the coast of Maharashtra to go *via* Gujarat through under water pipeline and from there to reach to the North thus depriving gas for us for all time to come. Sir, we had made a suggestion that now that your pipeline project is delayed, we do not want you to think afresh. You have already delayed too much. But our request now is that from Hazira, at least a tapping should be given for a fertilizer plant in Malkapur which is along the Bhusaval railwayline. And if possible the line can go up to Aurangabad in Marathwada. This is for your consideration because the people of Maharashtra feel that a grave injustice has been done to them on this pipeline project.

Now, I come to my question. I would like the Minister to reply to all my questions and be frank because he has not been associated with this pipeline project and so he can afford to tell where exactly the things went wrong. My first question would be: When is the contract going to be decided or will there be another Committee? Is it going to be turn-key? Or as the rumours are in the market that again you are going to give out in three or four pieces and so whether it is going to be turn key or again a multiple point one. What is the new schedule, complete schedule of laying the pipeline at various stages as well as the fertilizer plants? You have told me the last date. But I want the entire schedule. Did the P. K. Kaul Committee receive any revised offer from the four mentioned companies so far? Has any revised offer come to them on the basis of which you are reconsidering it? And what is the period of the validity? I know that the validity of these offers was up to 14th February. Now, one

month's extension has been asked. I want to know whether the extension has been given. I would like to know the period of validity. I would like to know whether there is any effect of the Yen. Yen price compared to dollar has gone up by 15 per cent. And because of that, are you going to review that project? And also the Snam Progetti expressed grave doubts about the N. K. K. of Japan about its competence. We would like to know the Government's opinion on that. What type of engine are you going in for? We would like to know whether you would give this additional pipeline to Maharashtra.

Sir, before I sit down, I would like to request the hon. Minister that please decide this on merit, in the national interest and without any outside interference. And the work must start immediately.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the statement by the Minister is an attempt to conceal more than to reveal. From the statement it is clear that the final decision has not yet been taken by the Government in regard to the awarding of the contract to some of the bidders. Anyway, there has been some delay in finalising the contract and this was admitted by no less a person than the Prime Minister of our country. He is on the record to say that there has been some delay as the matter will be taken up and finalised soon. This statement, I suppose, was made by him on the 20th of January last. Sir, again on the 21st January or something like that, the Prime Minister is also on the record to say, and I quote: "There were strong complaints"—the words he used were "strong complaints'—" and those complaints were from high quarters." Naturally, it is assumed that the high quarters are the Government of Canada and the Government of Italy. "The nature of the complaints, I assume, was something of the nature that certain earlier items of contracts are being diluted." And he has used the word 'dilution'. Now, I want to know this thing from you, Sir, because you are the guardian of this House: Is it proper or can the Government or any Government of a sovereign and free country countenance any complaint of a foreign Government in matters relating to simple commercial contract, which is essentially a business proposition; nothing to do with anything else? Why does the Government yield, I would say, to the so-called complaints, whether strong or mild, so as to start the discussion de *novo*? My pertinent question in this regard is whether the Government did countenance a complaint coming from a foreign Government in relation to a matter which is essentially a domestic matter and a commercial affair of our country. Now, the Prime Minister has also mentioned about the dilution of the tender document. I do not know what he really means by that dilution of tender document. But I know in the original tender document it was stated hat the leader of the consortium should have executed a minimum of 1,000 kilometres of surface pipeline to qualify for the contract. That is, the minimum qualification for the bidder should be that they have the experience of laying down of one thousand kilometres of surface pipelines. Now, it is known from the statement made earlier that certain other companies namely, Snam Progetti, Italian company, and the Nova Corp, the Canadian company, did not meet this requirement at all. Both of them have got no experience of laying down surface pipeline, not to speak of one thousand kilometres. What at best is their qualification is that they had some experience of supervising over the laying of pipelines. Now, my question arises from this: Is it this particular aspect which has been meant as dilution by the Prime Minister. As a matter of fact this Snam Progetti and Nova Corp. are not entitled to submit their quotation because they do not qualify themselves on the ground that they have got no experience of laying down of one thousand kilometres of surface pipeline Is it dilution which the Prime Minister means? And, if so, why was it diluted at all? And why

these two companies have also been included in the bidders list over which discussions are taking place.

Now the question of indigenous expertise is of crucial importance for a country like ours. We want to see that our public sector industries which have already assimilated, consolidated the indigenous expertise should be made use of properly and should not be sacrificed over this. Now, I want to know from the hon. Minister very precisely whether the Government would take proper care to see that the GAIL's business interest in this contract is also properly taken care of, protected and preserved and advanced. Sir, I am told that some proposals are being advanced particularly by this Snam Prgetti that if they get contract they want to do that job through the Nova Corp. which is a fully owned subsidiary of Snam Progetti, the Italian firm which, I will again repeat, is not even qualified to offer the bid. This particular question requires a clarification from the Minister.

Now, it has been stated that the entire job has been again referred back to a committee headed by Mr. P. K. Kaul, Cabinet Secretary and I think you will agree with me that the committee would take considerable time to understand the complexities and intricacies of the project itself and also examine the offers made by different consortia and come to a specific conclusion. Therefore, delay is unavoidable. The pipeline has already been delayed by one year and it is likely to be delayed by several years in this process. In this context I want to know whether the Government can tell this House how this delay would affect the consequent six gas fertilizer plants which are proposed to be set up on the route of this pipeline, what would be the estimate of delay in finalising the contract and what would be the cost escalation of this project and the time over-run. Lastly, I also want to know whether the Government is aware of the fact that the first project along the route would be in Guna in Madhya Pradesh. This project is now proceeding on schedule; it requires gas by March, 1987 and in case gas is not available for the Guna project, it will have to incur very heavy losses, and similarly other projects which are proposed to be set up on this route will equally have to incur heavy losses, thereby causing very heavy drainage in the public exchequer. Would the Government assure the House about the time schedule by which these six gas-based plants would be set up taking into consideration the delay caused in finalising the contract and also give an estimate of time over-run and also the cost escalation of this project?

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the statement made by the Minister of State for Petroleum and Natural Gas is, to say the least, an attempt to cover up the various aspects which are glaring aspects on the face regarding the approval of a tender which has to go into making the HBJ gas pipeline project. As has already been stated, it has two phases. In the first phase, the importance of the gas pipeline was realised as early as April, 1984 and organisation was estabilised for undertaking the completion of this project, namely, GAIL —the Gas Authority of India Limited. As it was stated, it was thought that turn-key basis may not encourage the indigenous components as an organisation like GAIL could do it. Therefore, tenders were called for only specific aspects of the project. The tenders were opened and all that is a known history. For this case, specifically, a committee of Secretaries was appointed, and in reply to my question on 3rd March, 1985 the Minister has said that the Committee has submitted its report. If the Committee has submitted its report, the Commitee of Secretaries, the Minister should have made it a point to men-

[Prof. C. Lakshmanna]

tion as to what are the recommendations of this Committee and the various points raised by the Committee in recommending whatever they have recommended. Now, in the same answer, he has said that bids in complete shape had been received from four consortia and he has given the names. In the end, he said, the tender has provided for due weightage to be given to the indigenous content in the bid. It must have been one of the considerations by the Committee of Secretaries. If that is the case, if the Gas Authority of India Limited has recommended, if the Committee of Secretaries. If that is the case, if they have delayed it for all these months without taking a decision? Is it merely because some of the firms who do not find favour with the decision of the Committee of Secretaries or the Gas Authority of India Limited, are pressurising the Government to overlook the recommendations in order that that particular firm gets the favour? If that is the case. I would like to know from the hon. Minister as to how much long they will take in even examining. Secondly, I would like to ask the hon Minister, who are the people who are examining it? The Committee of Secretaries has examined this. The Gas Authority of India Limited has also examined this. Both these bodies have made recommendations. If that is the case, under whose consideration is the tender now for more than four or five months? I would also ask the Minister to let the House know as to what will be the cost escalation over the Rs. 1,700 crores which was the original estimate. If that is the case, if there is escalation, does this also lead to further delay in the matter and what will be its cumulative effect in terms of production of fertiliser etc.? I would like the Minister to throw light on these aspects.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri V. M. Jadhav.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH (West Bengal): Sir, it is our turn. It should be according to the names.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV (Maharashtra): This should come to our party now.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: This is not the procedure in the Calling-Attention.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Mostafa Bin Quasem.

SHRI MOSTAFA BIN QUASEM (West Bengal): Sir, the HBJ pipeline project apparently appears to me to be a battle between inlaws and outlaws. This being so, I need not unnecessarily poke my nose into that. But what I would like to emphasise is this.

SHRI LAL K ADVANI (Madhya Pradesh): We are concerned with the law.

SHRI MOSTAFA BIN QUASEM: There has been an inordinate delay on the part of the Government to implement this project. During the span of last two years, the Government has suffered from indecisions and vacillations. Much has been talked about this both inside the House and outside the House I do not want go into the details. But what I would like to put on record is that by making a reversal of the earlier decision of the Government, to give the contract to indigenous firms, by the decision to give the contract to foreign multinationals, the Government has already given a burial to the prospect and possibility of development of indigenous technology and absorption thereof in our country. Sir, it is reported that the Gas Authority of India Limited and the Engineers India Limited, on the basis of the bids in the global tender, decided to give the contract to the French-led consortium. And I would like to point out that on vital tender specification is that the bidder shall make maximum possible utilization of indigenous manufacturing facilities and experiences.

We are not in a position to know whether this tender specification was given due weightage by GAIL while deciding to give the contract to the French consortium. It has also been reported that because of certain complaints made by other bidders—complaints received by the Prime Minister's Secretariat—the decision to award the contract to the French consortium has been postponed and a new Committee headed by the Cabinet Secretary, Mr. P. K. Kaul, has been appointed to review the whole situation. Here my first question to the hon. Minister is this: Because he has not made anything clear as to what were the objections from other bidders? He should please give us to know at least the nature of these objections.

My second question in this respect is whether the review by the present Committee is confined merely to choosing between this foreign multinational or that foreign multi-national, or whether the present Committee would also make its business to review the recommendations of the earlier Committee which was in favour of giving the contract to our own public sector enterprises and indigenous firms.

It has been reported in the press that French consortium's quotation is reported to the lowest—*i.e.* Rs. 739.38 crores, including a foreign exchange component of Rs. 430.75 crores etc. etc. The bid by the consortium led by M/s. Snam Progetti of Italy was Rs. 859.29 crores, followed by Rs. 1216 crores by M/s. Nova Corp. of Canada. Sir, we from this side want to make it clear that so far as awarding the contract to a firm is concerned, we are strongly opposed to considerations other than the consideration of economy on our part, consideration of efficiency and considerations which are not commensurate with our national interest. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether the Government is preoccupied with any consideration other than these, which is causing delay in arriving at a final decision in awarding the contract to a particular firm.

Thirdly, I would like to say that there has already been much delay and considering the present trend, the project is not likely to start before the end of this year. I would like to know from the hon. Minister what is the present computation of cost of the project and because of the delay what is the quantum of cost escalation in implementing this project?

Finally, Sir, the Minister in his statement, which is inadequate in every respect, gives us practically nothing new to know. But he poses that the Government continues to be on the right track so far as this HBJ pipeline project is concerned and for obivous reasons he will try to keep the image of the Government clean. I would like to urge upon the hon. Minister to place all the details concerning this HBJ pipeline project, particularly the recommendations of the earlier Committee of Secretaries and the recommendations of the prosent Committee of Secretaries headed by the Cabinet Secretary, if it has been given to the Government, before both Houses of Parliament, so that there may be a parliamentary scrutiny over the whole thing, and so that the present Government may not be charged not only for the present but also for any future time of contributing to what is presently being termed as something like a national scandal. With this, Sir, I conclude.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, my intervention is not going to be very lengthy. I would like to state at the very beginning that as far as the technical aspects of the HBJ pipeline project are concerned, I do subscribe to the view that it is the Government that is best placed to judge the issue and I, therefore, won't go into the technical aspects at all. As to the relative merits or demerits of one commercial organi-

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

zation against another, that also I am not going to go into. As to their respective commercial fortunes or misfortune, that is a matter of profound indifference to me. Whether Spie-Capag wins the contract or Snam Progetti wins it, I am totally indifferent to it. Bu I am not indifferent to what is crucial, and is at the heart of this discussion. I am not indifferent to delay, I am not indicerent to cost escalation, I am not indifferent to indigenization, I am not indifferent and cannot be indifferent to smells, suggestions, innuendoes, insinuations of corruption in high places. There are two stages of this project. One is which is by now a highly controversial project. One is, what I call, the pre-assassination stage, and then there is a post-assassination stage. The Pre-assassination stage: Barely had the late Prime Minister been assassinated, then amongst the first decisions taken by the successor Government of India was to overturn the decision of the previous Government.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: The Minister was assassinating the project.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Therefore, I call it pre-assassination stage and post-assassination stage. I have a few queries because the porject is still the same. I have a few queries on the eariler to raise on the pre-assassination stage and I will go straightway with the clarifications. I do request the Chair, because I have experienced earlier that in the clarifications. I had sought on HBJ, the replies had been wholly inadequate, whole questions have been left out and, therefore, I would plead with you at the very outset to see that the Minister replies to each of the queries that I ask because I am not going into the history, technical aspects or any of the other aspects of the commercial firms involved. My first query, therefore, on the pre-assassination stage of this project is: Is it correct that starting from March-April 1984 the Government had allocated a total span only of 36 months for the completion of the entire HBJ project inclusive of tendering and supply of gas to the last fertilizer plant? This is a very specific question and I would like a specific answer. I am talking of the pre-assassination stage. Question 2: What were the recommendations at different periods of time on this project by the Ministry of Petroleum, Committee of Secretaries, thereafter an Empowered Committee of 17 specially selected Secretaries, thereafter the Professor M.G.K. Menon Review Committee? Question 3: Is it not correct that at all stages all these committees had categorically rejected the turnkey concept? Who, therefore, advised its adoption and what were the reasons for so doing. Question 4: Is it not correct that an Italian firm, by name Snam Progetti, did not even participate in the global tendering in the pre-assassination stage of this project? Despite that, is was on account of the objections raised by Snam Progetti that the whole question of turnkey versus piecemeal was reopened: Why?

It is at this tage that we enter the post-assassination stage. Now I won't go into the details because a number of speaker's have already gone into the stale aspects of what happens in the technical evaluation commercial evaluation price evaluation of this stage after we have switched from piecemeal to turnkey. The questions that arise therefore, at the switched stage, at the post-assassination stage, a the turnkey stage now are:

One: by whom and at what stage of the consideration of the tenders was objection raised about one of the members of the Spie Capag consortium? I will repeat it because the Minister has not perhaps understood this question. It is the post-assassination stage, the post-piecemeal stage now. The first query is: from whom and at what stage of the consideration of the

tenders was objection raised about one of the members of the Spie Capag consortium? What was the nature of that objection?

Two. the Prime Minister is said to have stated that complaints were raised from high places. Is it a normal commercial practice to entertain objections about tenders which have already been opened, whatever the origin of the complaint?

Three: what were the recommendations of the Cabinet Committee headed by the Cabinet Secretary?

Four: what then was the reason for referring the whole matter, as I believe it has been referred to the Finance Minister, when the tender document itself says that for the purpose of evaluation of this the prices in U. S. dollars expressed by the bidders in the bids would also be converted into Indian rupees at the State Bank of India B. C. selling exchange rate between the Indian rupee and the U. S. dollar prevailing on the date the price part of the *bids were opened.*

I will repidly finish my intervention, Sir.

Is it also correct that despite the firming up of the Yen as it were, the Kaul Committee had reportedly found that the French offer was still lower by $35 million.

Finally, Sir, three clarifications about the total project:

Since March-April, 1984 on how many occasions have tenders been called for relating to this project, decisions deferred on tenders already received and committee investigation instituted into the project?

Two: is it correct, Sir, that on 30th April, 1985 the Minister then in charge had given a categorical assurance in this House that all formalities about tender evaluation would be completed by December, 1985? So, who and what is responsible for this bias being shown towards people with Italian connections?

My final question is—it will not take even a minute: Has the Government computed the cost of the delay of this project in terms of output foregone, cancelled letters of intent issued to public sector companies like the Bharat Heavy Electricals, additional interest charges their capitalisation, global inflation plus higher cost of turn key as against piecemeal?

Please give all these figures if you can.

In conclusion, Sir, a word of caution to the hon. Minister. This particular port-folio, the Ministry he is currently holding, has become casualty prone. We have witnessed in the past two years during the pendency of this by now the *infamous HBJ* project a number of Ministers come and a number of Ministers go.

The hon member initiating this discussion talked of....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We do not have the time to go into such details.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am concluding, Sir.

The hon. member, initiating the discussion talked about inlaws and outlaws. Don't worry about inlaws and outlaws.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR SINGH: Is this also a part of the HBJ Project according to you?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Yes. He has made a mention. Therefore, I would earnestly appeal to you, Mr. Minister..

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR SINGH: Kindly don't bring extreneous factors here.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I would appeal to you. Don't worry about inlaws and outlaws. Only worry about laws.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta. Please be brief because we are running short of time.

1 P.M.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir this is yet another example of how the Government of India is functioning now-a-days. It takes a decision on a day, the day after it changes it and then it sets up a committee to review whether the change in the decision was correct or not. Actually, the Government does not know its mind, it does not know what is its policy and it does not know what is the national interest. I call this Government a Government which has become a prisoner of indecision.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR SINGH: Is there any relevance to it?

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Yes, it is relevant.

Secondly, we discussed this problem through a Call Attention motion when the present Minister was not in-charge of it. At that period of time we had also brought about certain problems before the Minister. I say this is one of the rarest scandals that the Indian Parliament is discussing for over a year. I call it a scandal because from the beginning something was very unusual with the whole thing. When Prime Minister Indira Gandhi was alive, a decision was taken that the construction will be handed over to Indian contractors i.e. it will be done by the Indian technologists with the Indian infrastructure; and if and when it is necessary we shall be taking foreign help. After she was assassinated, not only that policy has been assassinated, but the Indian interest is also being assassinated. Therefore, after her death a global tender is being floated. May I ask the hon. Minister, who is very much interested in relevance and irrelevance, to tell me why his predecessor, or the Government he represents, did not think it necessary and proper to consult the Soviet Union whom it considers to be one of its the closest friends in regard to this. The Minister and his Government knows that the Soviet Union has built up the longest pipeline in the whole of the world from Siberia to the Western Europe. May be, it has been done with the aid of other technology, but whatever it might be, the Soviet Union has in its possession the experience of building up one of the longest pipelines. Even while we have friendship, cooperation consul and a friendship pact, why did we not think it necessary to consult the Soviet Union. Even if you may not think it proper that is should be done by the Soviet Union or a Soviet organisation, yet you could at least have asked for their advice because from our national experience we have found on a number of occasions that the Soviet Union has always come to our aid while the Western powers had tried to sabotage our intereststs.

Thirdly, there are now four bidders. I do not know whether the new Minister, who has become incharge of the Department very late—let me call him apprentice Minister', because he does not know the details about it, because he has been talking of relevance and irrelevance, and from the point of view of experience every man has to understand what the complexities are. If you call my addressing him like that as an aspersion, then let me try to amend it. There is no problem, but the point is that there are four bidders, four multi-nations, we are not concerned as to who will get the cake...

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR SINGH: Sir, do you expect that he will get up and not cast aspersions.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Sir, I do not know when the Minister is disturbed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: But as : Minister has to tell me. Of course, he in reply.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please go ead.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: It ems you are being aided very ably by e Minister himself. I don't know Anyay.

SHRI BIR BHADRA PRATAP INGH (Uttar Pradesh): It is his duty to terrupt.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: It his duty to reply, not to interrupt.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please o not waste time.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: /e have new experience from our ew Minister. 'New Minister' is not an spersion. I can tell him new Minier anyway. But at least the point is iat we are having four international ms varying with each other, pressrising and counter-pressurising, ading and counter-trading. There is rumour going on in the capital that ioney is having its play, not always e white money, but the black money also having its play, in the decion which is going on. My party is ot interested who gets it. My party not interested which multi-nation- gets it. My party is not interested ho grabs the cake and who shares ie cake. But we are interested when ie decision is going to be made on iis project. We are interested when ie project is going to be implemented. We are interested whether ur funds are going to be squanded away. We are interested whether ur national interest is going to be old out by the Government in power nd by this Department. This is very nportant because there was a resigation from the Secretary of this epartment. Apart from this, there so much scandal not only in this ountry but out side the country lso. Therefore I do not want to raise ie question of inlaws and outlaws. ut the point is that multi-nationals are being allowed to mount pressure and counter-pressure. Somebody from West Germany—somebody from France—somebody from Japan and somebody from Italy are coming and they are mounting pressure on our Government. In the face of their pressure, the Government of India is faltering shamelessly. That is the reason why committees after committees are being set up before coming to a decision.

Anyway, in conclusion, I have a very simple question to put to the Honourable Minister. I hope he will find time to answer my point.

My point is that you found more gas sources in the Western shore and, therefore, the pipeline that is being constructed, whether the entire gas through the pipeline will be utilised only for setting up of fertilizer plants and two of the three power plants by the monopoly concerns in the country or a part of the gas will be utilised for LPG cylinders for domestic consumption? We know that recently the Government of India has been very generous in enhancing the price of gas cylinders which has burdened the middle class people. As is well-known that this gas is very cheap and it can be supplied to the common consumers. Therefore, I would like to know whether the Government is contemplating to divert—if at all this project is completed within this century—a part of the gas for LPG cylinders for cooking purposes? Now, the gas has become very expensive because of the Government's decision. I hope the Minister would reply at least to this point. Thank you.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, this Hazira-Bijaipur-Jagdishpur gas pipeline is one of the most prestigious projects of this country which involves Rs. 1700.17 crores with a total length of 1730 km.

[Shri Vithalrao Madhavrao Jadhav]

Some of the Members have charged the Ministry and the Department that it is being delayed considerably. Of course, it is not my outlook to answer this question. Since it is a prestigious project of the nation, it is bound to be delayed. In such an important project we have to consider a number of factors. (*Interruptions*).

They have also accused the Government about lobbying by this multinational or that multinational. Sir, as far as the Congres (I) party is concerned, it is not the agent of any multi-national. There might be some agents from that side working for some multinationals, and therefore, they are interested in getting the work awarded to those multi-nationals. But we are not interested in any multinational.

I agree with my hon. friend, Mr. Suresh Kalmadi who has strongly pleaded for a fertilizer plant at Malkapur. This HBJ gas pipeline is coming through Malkapur. This Malkapur comes in the Vidharba area which is enclosing Marathwada. It is agriculturally a potential area. Therefore, I request the Government to give sympathetic consideration for setting up of a fertilizer plant at Malkapur in the Vidharbha area.

If it is not possible for the Government of India to set up a fertilizer plant at Malkapur, because any fertilizer plant requires more water, then, they may shift it from Malkapur to Aurangabad *via* Bombay where the Jayakwadi project is already there. Moreover the Godavari river is also very nearby. It will be very beneficial for that area in terms of employment to the people and fertilizers to the farmers. I request the Honourable Minister to consider this demand sympathetically.

Sir, on this HBJ pipeline, one fertilizer plant is coming up at Shajehanpur. So I would like to know whether it is being delayed by two years from the eariler scheduled date of completion due to lack of finances from the concerned parties? Or is it that this Caparo group is to interested in setting up a gas-based fertilizer plant at Shahjahanpur? Similarly I would like to know whether it is a fact that the site selected earlier by the Government is being changed on the request of the party. If so, what will be the next site?

Sir, now I will come to some of the pertinent questions relating to Maharashtra. The Oil and Natural Gas Commission wants to establish a Southern Terminal of the ONGC at Usar. They have made a survey and the Maharashtra Government also helped them in making the survey. Some 16 sites were surveyed and out of those 16 sites, the Petroleum Department selected one site at Usar. The Maharashtra Government has fulfilled all the formalities. Later on the Minister for Industries, Maharashtra, has also addressed a D. O. letter to the Union Minister of State for Petroleum, New Delhi, on 5th February, 1986, requesting him to confirm, on the background that the Planning Commission has now finalised its plan allocations and accepted the State's proposal without any cut, that the Second Gas Terminal be set up at Usar without further delay. So it must be clarified as to when the Second Terminal is coming up at Usar.

Another thing is that, as my friend has rightly said, Bombay High is supplying gas to six or seven fertilizer plants in Northern India. Actually it is not the monopoly of Maharashtra or Bombay to utilise that gas because we are in India and Maharashtra is more secular, more national and more patriotic. We have no objection for that. But the demand of Maharashtra regarding gas is very important. The Maharashtra Gov-

ernment is constantly demanding 32 million cubic metres of gas per day but till today the Government of India has not sanctioned it. Sir, the Maharashtra Government had in June, 1982 communicated to the Government of India the total requirements of industrial gas for Maharashtra from Bombay High to the extent of about 32 million cubic metres per day for various projects as indicated below:

R.C.F. Trombay	2·38	million cubic metres per day.
R.C.F., Thal-Vaishet.	4·46	
Deepak Fertilizers, Taloja.	0·30	
LPG production and self consumption by ONGC.	1·20	
Tata Thermal Station, Trombay.	3·27	
MSEB, Urban.	1·84	

It comes to a total of 13.45 million cubic metres per day. or projects approved in principle, the demand is:

Domestic consumers, Bombay	1·00	million cubic meters per day.
Textile Mills, Bombay	1·02	
Bharat Electronics & Indo-Asahi (TV shells)	0·09	
Gas Cracer & Petrochemical comples, Nagothane (MGCC & MPCL)	1·60	
Hindustan Organic Chemicals, Rasayani	0·48	

It comes to a total of 4.19 million cubic metres per day. or the projects under consideration, the demand is:

Methanol-3000 TPD	3·00	million cubic metres per day.
Sponge Iron Project	0·50	
New Fertiliz r Plants. 1350 TPD of Ammonia+DAP	2·40	
900 TDP of Ammonia + DAP	1·60	
Union Carbide of India Ltd.	0·12	
New Projects like Methyl Methacrylate Hydrocyanic Acid, Chloramethanes, etc.	0·86	
Glass Industries	0·30	
MSEB (Additional 4 turbines)	1·84	
Domestic Consumers in Nashik, Pune, Thane, Ambernath, Ulhasnagar, Bhiwandi, Kalyan, etb.	0·60	
Industries in above, areas.	3·00	

[Shri Vithalrao Madhavrao Jadhav]

The total comes to 14.22 million cubic metres. So the total demand from Maharashtra is 31.66 million cubic metres per day. Whatever crude or petroleum product is available in Bombay High, the consumption from it by Maharashtra is small. For example, Gujarat consumes a larger quantity of their products as compared to Maharashtra. So I request the hon. Minister to ensure 32 million cubic metres of gas per day from Bombay High for the various projects of Maharashtra. Sir, I thank you very much for giving me this opportunity.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Karnataka): Mr. Deputy Chairman, since many aspects have been covered by my honourable colleagues, I will be very brief. What has cast doubt and misgiving in respect of this project is the approach of the Government and the delay in taking a decision with regard to this matter. My friends have already drawn attention of the Minister and other Members of the House to the fact that there has been doubt, apprehension and suspicion about the bona fides of the Government in this matter. I do not know whether there is any truth in this. But the fact is the project is very vital and the Government of India showed all sense of urgency in this regard earlier. The decision had to be taken about this pipeline in the month of December last, and all effort to evaluate, assess, about the tenders was made, two firms—Gas Authority of India and Engineers India—were entrusted with this responsibility. After all this there is dithering on the part of the Government, there is vacillation, procrastination, doubt in their own mind. And this has been misconstrued by many quarters that the Government seems to be subjected to pressures, influences, by various other extraneous considerations. We are not to be blamed for that. They are to be blamed for all this. Therefore, the Government has to clarify first and foremost why there has been so much delay in taking a decision on this project when this project was considered as the most important. Perhaps this project had to cater to six fertilizer projects and two power stations. Therefore, there is something hsny and messy about the whole affair. It is shrouded in mystery, if I may say so. So, it is the duty of the Minister who has now taken over—I don't blame him—to clarify the whole thing, to clear the atmosphere. Secondly, I would like to know whether at any stage of matter of splitting this project was considered at all. In other words, I would like to know whether there was a choice between the turnkey approach and the piecemeal approach, whether the Government was faced with the problem of giving any part of this project to indigenous industry, whether there was a suggestion that indigenous knowhow which was available could be taken. What did the Government do in this matter at the time of considering the tender? I would lik to know from the honourable Minister whether the tender that was considered on the basis of the recommendations made by the Gas Authority of India was that of the Spie Capag—Nova Corp. Consortium. I want to know whether it was the lowest tender and whether they were competent to undertake this responsibility, and why, if they had no experience at all, the Gas Authority of India Limited made a recommendation in favour of that Consoritum.

Sir, I do not want this project to be delayed nor my friend would like it to be delayed. But it has been delayed and it gives scope for escalation of costs and prices. Therefore, I would like him to enlighten us, taking the House into confidence, as to what the factors are which are holding him from taking a decision and why there are committees after committees and why there is evaluation after evaluation, why this is

being done in this way and for what purpose. I would like him to clear the doubts in the mind of the public that some consortium is being favoured by the Government of India, that it is caught in a dilemma and that it is being pressurised and counter pressurised in this regard. I would like him to clarify all these doubts and misgivings which are there very much in the public mind. Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think the Minister can reply now.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR SINGH: Sir, I would not like to comment or some of the sweeping observations made by some of the honourable Members and I would also not take note of the not-so-proper language used by an honourable Member because I think any intemperate language is not going to make up for the weakness of the argument. The honourable Member just now referred to delays and doubts about it, about pressures being exerted and about extraneous influences working in respect of this project. I would make it very clear that if there is any such doubt, it is entirely baseless, and no extraneous influence is working on which we base our decision in this regard. If there are doubts entrenched in the minds of some people somewhere, we cannot help it. All that we can do is to proceed in a fair and a regular manner and come to a decision in the larger interests of the country and to make it very clear as to how this is being done.

Sir, I would not like to dwell on the past history of it. But some Members raised the question of the indigenous organisations not having been entrusted with the responsibility of the implementation of this important project. I would like to tell the House—and perhaps they well know —that quotations were asked for. But meanwhile the Menon Committee which was asked to examine the capability of GAIL and EIL to implement this project observed that management and organisational aspects and timely completion of the project are likely to be sources of concern. In the light of this, Government considered that effective project coordination could be ensured only if a single point responsibility was given to one agency for the execution of the pipeline laying work with other necessary facilities. But I would again like to clarify that Government are fully conscious of the fact that the indigenous capacities available in the country should be made use of and they should be offered adequate opportunity to participate, not just from the angle of participation but also from the angle of transfer of technology. And all the four bidders have indicated which are their partners. I would not like to go into details because at this stage when we are in the final stage of consideration, I would not like to...

SHRI SURESH KALMADI: You have been at the final stage for the past two years.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR SINGH: I do not want to convey the impression that we have a certain set of attitudes towards one or the other. So I would not like to go into details as to which are the Indian partners, which are the bidders, whom they have as their partners. And I would like to assure the House that the Government, while taking a final decision, will fully consider that indigenous capacities are encouraged, promoted and made capable of larger responsibilities in the future.

I would like to briefly give the details of how the project and the consideration of the bids have gone on. It is true that after the bids were received, the Ambassadors of the Governments of Canada and Italy raised certain doubts, certain issues, about the competence of some of the bidders. I would not like to name them. Government thought that since this was being raised at the level of the Government we should give due consideration to it. A committee was

[Shri Chandra Shekhar Singh]

formed with the Cabinet Secretary as the Chairman not to re-evaluate all the bids but to go into the specific points raised by the two Governments. Some Members have asked the question, how long will they take to report back? I would like to tell the House that there is nothing to hide, that the Kaul Committee has reported back. They have not taken a long time to finalise their recommendations, and it is with the Government. Some hon. Members also raised the point why the Finance Ministry has been involved. That is the regular procedure. The evaluation of the financial and credit package is done in all such cases.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): On a point of order. Now it is 1.30, and today it is non-official business. Sir, this is time for recess. The Minister may be asked to complete his reply after lunch.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR SINGH: I will be brief. I shall conclude just now.

SHRI SURESH KALMADI: Don't be brief. We want full information.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR SINGH: I shall tell what I have to tell. I shall not be brief on the substance of it. So, this is the regular procedure and the Finance Ministry's advice on the evaluation of the financial and credit packages is taken in all such cases. This is nothing extraordinary. Some hon. Members not all, appear to be very much concern ed about the fortunes of one bidder or the other. I am sorry to say that not only the arguments but even the language of what they have said in the representations made to the Government from time to time seems to have been reproduced. An hon. Member was referring to lobby. I would only tell him that we should keep ourselves at a distance from all these lobbies. They might try to brief one or the other on how strong their case is, but we should not be swayed by their logic and their arguments. They should not take what they are telling them and what they are conveying to them as gospel truth. They should have trust in their wisdom and in the wisdom of the Government to take a correct decision in this matter.

An important point that has been raised in the discussion is about delays which are likely to occur. I would like to reassure the House that even at the time of project approval, it was specified that the project completion schedule is 63 months, i. e. July 1989. I emphasise that no change is expected in this completion schedule. It actually means that no delay is likely to occur in the final completion of the project. I would like to explain a small thing. So, largely we are adhereing to the schedule. My predecessor gave an assurance to which the hon. Members referred, that the decision about the contract would be taken by the end of December, 1985. This is March 1986. We are two months and a few days behind the schedule. We should have tried to do it in time by December 31, 1985. But there has been a delay of two months and a few days. At the moment, we are evaluating the bids and I would like to reiterate to the House that keeping in view the present international situation, we shall evaluate and take a final decision considering their relative prices, their financial and credit packages and would try to secure the maximum advantage in terms of minimisation of cost and maximising the indigenous content, facilitating technology transfer and retaining the timeframe of the project. These are the considerations which would weigh

with us and which are weighing with us. And the delay that has occurred shall not be allowed to thwart or hamper the fertilizer plants which are going to be put up. It has been said and concern was rightly expressed that the Guna fertilizer project—the commissioning date of which is September, 1987—might get delayed. I would like to assure the House that this critical portion from Hazira to Bijapur shall tried to be completed by 31st March, 1987. There is still a time availability of six months. However, as a contingency measure, alternative arraingements have been made so that the boilers could be started up on naphtha if need be. That arrangement has been made. And this standby arrangement has been made for all the plants. So, this is not going to have any impact on the commissioning of the Guna fertilizer plant. We would like to assure that we are making all eflorts and we think it would be possible for us to stick the given time schedule for all the fertilizer plants and the power plants. And again more pertinent point is that some delay in decision taking may result not in escalation of cost which you apprehend but in cost reduction. Yes. It is because this may give time to us to study things and go into the depth and take the best advantage of the present situation. Our point of view is clear that whatever delay is occuring of two or three months, it may result in cost reduction and not escalation of the cost. So, the apprehension of the hon Members on this point I would like to tell them, is not properly founded. And we shall take every care to see that the total cost of the project is the minimum possible. I do not think that there is any thing more than what the hon. Members have said about it. Mr. Kalmadi wanted to know how long the offers are valid. The offers are valid upto 24th of March, 1986. And I would like to tell the House that we are making all efforts to see that the decision is taken within this period. So, to recapitulate, whatever delay has occurred of two or three months, may result in cost reduction, to benefit the country. It is in our national interest that we have delayed it for two or three months. There is nothing wrong in it. And again this commissioning schedule of all the fertilizer plants and the power plants is not going to be affected by it. We shall adhere to the schedule. We shall see that every arrangement is made to see that the gas requirements of all the fertilizer and power plants are met in time. And to repeat again, the decision about the contract shall be taken in the larger national interest to keep the cost at the minimum level to see indigenous capacities are fully utilised, encouraged, promoted and strengthened, to see that these indigenous companies acquire the technology so that in future when we have another project like this. their participation may increase and thereby we are taking full care of all the points of view expressed by hon. Members. I would like to ask where is the apprehension, where is doubt, why are you suspicious about it? Just because a few people are roaming about in the streets of Delhi telling some of you, I do not cast any aspersions on you. They have every right to approach you and you have every right to listen to them, but that should not lead you to the conclusion that what they are dinning into your ears is correct and what we, your colleagues, are telling you, is wrong. How do you presume this? I would like to assure you and tell you that all of us sitting here...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): The people roaming in the streets are not that much intelligent.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR SINGH: ...in this House are acting in the larger national interest. If you can develop doubts and suspicions in your mind, don't you think that we also can deve-

[Shri Chandra Shekhar Singh]

lop such doubts and suspicions? We do not have them. I would like to assure you, I still think and I am of the confirmed view, that you shall take the view that Government is taking, adopting the correct procedure, and will take a correct decision about it. But I would again like to request you that doubts and suspicions about Government or the Members or the Opposition do not lead us anywhere. It is not fair on our part to cast doubts about anybody else's *bona fides* and this word should be used with great care and caution. We are not here to just cast doubts about and on each other.

About Maharashtra, I would like to tell the hon. Member that the interests of Maharashtra are fully safe in our hands and you should have no apprehension on that account.

SHRI SURESH KALMADI: Are you giving us the plant or not? That is important.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR SINGH: In Maharashtra there are already three fertiliser plants receiving gas. I do not want to name them. You know them. And the Maharashtra Government had been informed that should more gas be available subsequently, their request for further allocation would be considered and certainly the hon. Member has pleaded for setting up of certain plants in Maharashtra and we shall certainly keep it in our view, gas finds are likely to be much more, and more gas is likely to be available in future. We hope that something more would be done for Maharashtra and more gas-based indusries would be coming up there.

Sir, I would like to conclude by reiterating to the House that there has been no delay. Some little delay that has occurred is likely to help us, is likely to result in greater gains for us from all angles and I would like to assure the House that the decision is going o be taken shortly. As I have said, we are trying to do it within the given time-frame and the House would come to know how we have used our disscre tion and our wisdom in this matter. Thank you very much.

SHRI SURESH KALMADI: The Government has totally bungled.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 2.30 P.M

The House then adjourned for lunch at forty-five minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at thirty-three minutes past two of the clock, Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (RAILWAYS) 1985-86

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENTS OF RAILWAYS (SHRI MADHAVRAO SCINDIA): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a statement (in English and Hindi) showing the supplementary Demands for Grants (Railways) for the year 1985-86. [Placed in Library. *See* No. LT-2182-A/86].

ANNOUNCEMENT RE. GOVERNMENT BUSINESS DURING THE WEEK COMMENCING 10TH MARCH, 1986

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (RAJYA SABHA) (SHRI SITARAM KESARI): With your permission, Sir, I rise to announce that Government Business in this House during the